

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 23-34. Applicant is amending Claim 23 herein to correct minor informalities in the claims. These amendments do not affect the scope of the claims and are not in response to a patentability rejection. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that these amendments be entered and allowed.

Applicant will now address each of the Examiner's remaining rejections in the order in which they appear in the Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §102

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects Claims 2, 3, 10, 21 and 22 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Yamazaki et al. (US patent publication 2002/0044124). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending independent Claim 2 to recite the feature that "at least two data lines are connected to different data drivers so as to simultaneously supply video signals to the pixels through the at least two data lines". This feature is supported by, for example, at least Figs. 2A and 14A and also page 8, ln. 22 - page 9, ln. 6 of the present application. Further, Applicant has amended the claim to change "each pixel column" to "each one of the pixel columns".

In contrast, Yamazaki '124 does not appear to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Hence, Yamazaki '124 does not disclose or suggest the display device of independent Claim 2.

Further, in order to advance prosecution and to clarify the claimed invention, Applicant is amending independent Claim 21. It is believed that amended Claim 21 is supported by, for

example, Fig. 5 of the present application. For instance, Fig. 5 shows one feature of the present invention wherein a plurality of data lines (SAi, SBi, SCi and SDi) are provided in one column, and they are connected to TFTs of different pixels in the same column. Applicant has incorporated this feature into Claim 21.

Yamazaki '124 does not appear to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. Hence, Yamazaki '124 does not disclose or suggest the display device of independent Claim 21.

Accordingly, independent Claims 2 and 21 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over Yamazaki '124, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 4-9 and 11-18

The Examiner also rejects Claims 4-9 and 11-18 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamazaki '124 in view of Yoshioka (US 5,999,154). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending the claims to change the terms “x” and “y” into specific numbers, such as for example, “at least two” or “at least one.”

It is respectfully submitted that neither cited reference discloses or suggests the feature of independent Claim 4 of wherein “at least two data lines out of the plurality of data lines extend in each one of the pixel columns and one scanning line out of the plural scanning lines extends in each one row”, or the feature of independent Claim 5 of “at least two data lines extending in each one pixel column.”

Further, it is respectfully submitted that neither reference is suitable for rejecting the

claims of the present application.

Accordingly, independent Claims 4 and 5 and those claims dependent thereon are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 19 and 20

The Examiner also rejects Claims 19 and 20 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimura (US Patent Publication 2001/0035863) in view of Yoshioka (US 5,999,154). This rejection is also respectfully traversed.

While Applicant traverses this rejection, in order to advance the prosecution of this application, Applicant is amending the claims to recite the feature that “the pixels each have a light emitting element and a TFT, wherein each of the TFTs is electrically connected to different data lines in a same pixel column.”

Kimura does not appear to disclose or suggest this claimed feature. For example, in contrast to the claimed device, in Figs. 3A and 3B in Kimura, TFT 301 in the first column and first row and TFT 301 in the first column and second row are connected to the same source line 307 (corresponding to the data line of the present invention). Hence, Kimura (and Yoshioka) does not disclose or suggest this claimed feature.

Further, Claims 19 and 20 have been amended in a similar manner as described above for Claims 4 and 5. Hence for similar reasons as discussed above, Yoshioka also does not disclose or suggest the method of Claims 19 and 20.

Accordingly, Claims 19 and 20 are patentable over the cited references, and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion


It is respectfully submitted that the present application is a condition for allowance and should be allowed.

If any fee is due for this amendment, please charge our deposit account 50/1039.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 22, 2006



Mark J. Murphy
Registration No. 34,225

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.
200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 236-8500

Customer No. 26568